APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/547,294	04/11/2000	Glen Sharp	SYMA-01043USOMCF/SES	4987

23910   7590   01/02/2003

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER
WANG, LIANG CHE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)
Offic Action Summary	09/547,294 ●	SHARP ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address* --

P ri d f r Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status
1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 April 2000_ .
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims
4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers
9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _11 April 2000_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120
13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)
1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _5_ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 have been examined.

Paper Submitted

2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of

record in the file:

    a. **Change of Address** as received on February 8th, 2002.

    b. **Information Disclosure Statements** as received on April 29th, 2002.

Priority

3. The drawings in this application are objected to by the Draftsperson as informal. Any

drawing corrections requested, but not made in the prior application should be repeated in

this application if such changes are still desired. If the drawings were changed and

approved during the prosecution of the prior application, a petition may be filed under 37

CFR 1.182 requesting the transfer of such drawings, provided the parent application has

been abandoned. However, a copy of the drawings as originally filed must be included in

the 37 CFR 1.60 application papers to indicate the original content.

Drawings

4. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for

examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is

allowed.

Specification

5. The uses of several trademarks have been noted in this application. They should be

capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

"**NetWareŒ**" in page 8 line 19, "**NetscapeŒ**" and "**MicorsoftŒ**" in page 12 lines

25, the symbol "**Œ**" is not cleared to the examiner, please correct them if they appeared

to be typos or provide the meaning of the symbol the first time it appears in the

disclosure.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary

nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any

manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

   a. Page 14 line 26, the word "**User's**", should be changed to "**Users**".

   b. Page 17 line 26, "**The attachment 1205**" should be "**The attachment 1250**"

      based on Figure 12.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
   subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 7 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set

forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

9. Referring to claim 7, claim 7 claimed a method dependent on claim 7 itself. Claim cannot be dependent on the claim itself because there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner views claim 7 is a dependent claim of claim 5 for further examination.

10. Referring to claims 18 and 19 are dependent on each other, which are not allowable because there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. The examiner views claim 18 is a dependent claim of claim 17 for further examination.

11. Referring to claim 20, claim 20 claimed a method dependent on claim 20 itself. Claim cannot be dependent on the claim itself because there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner views claim 20 is a dependent claim of claim 18 for further examination.

12. All dependent claims are rejected to as having the same deficiencies as the claims they depend from.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

DynamicAccesss® Technology, 3COM Technical Paper, hereinafter DynamicAccess in

views of Davis et al., US Patent Number 5,937,160 hereinafter Davis.

15. Referring to claim 1, DynamicAccess has taught a method for updating a configuration

specification of a computer, the method comprising the steps of:

    a. receiving a configuration file from administrator (page 10, col. 1, lines 29-30)

        containing location settings (page 10, col. 1, lines 17-22);

    b. writing location values corresponding to the location settings into the

        configuration specification of the computer (page 10, col. 1, lines 1-33.)

    DynamicAccess however has not explicitly taught the configuration is sent to the user

through e-mail.

    However, Davis has explicitly taught that any non-text file could be included with an

e-mail message as attachment. (Col 12, lines 43-45.)

    A person with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the main purpose

of the invention is to allow the administrator to send configuration file to the client's

computer. And using e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to send file from

one computer to another.

    Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have an e-mail containing location settings encoded in an

attachment, and let the user to receive the e-mail and to have the user's computer

configured by opening the attachment as taught by Davis, because e-mail attachment has

been a well-known method to communicating files between computers.

16. Referring to claim 2, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 1, DynamicAccess in views of Davis had further included the configuration includes a destination of a location name corresponding to the configuration specification (page 10, configuration sending from the administrator to the remote site must contain the destination for the location name corresponding to the configuration specification, otherwise the invention would not work for its purpose;) and wherein configuration specification of the computer corresponds to the location name. (page 1, the configuration is set by the administrator for a particular computer at a particular location so the client could work properly at the location and it is the whole purpose of DynamicAccess's invention, therefore the configuration specification of the computer must corresponds to the location name.)

17. Referring to claim 3, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 1, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings are generically defined so as to apply to a variety of operating systems. (Page 10, col. 2, lines 41-47; DynamicAccess could be used on a variety of operating system.)

18. Referring to claim 4, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 3, DynamicAccess has further taught determining an operating system type for the computer; and generating the location values by interpreting the location settings for the operating system type for the computer. (Page 10, paragraph 18 already stated that the invention could be applied to a variety of operating systems, therefore when the configuration file is sent from the administrator to the client, the operating system must be determined, and the location values must be generated by interpreting the

location settings for the operating system type for the computer, so the location settings

for this particular operating system could be configured into this particular computer.)

19. Referring to claim 5, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as

described in claim 4, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the interpreting step is

performed by referring to program logic which translates the location settings into

location values as a function of the operating system type for the computer. (Page 10,

paragraphs 19 already stated that the invention could be applied to a variety of operating

systems, and there must have program logic to translate the location settings into location

values for the computer.)

20. Referring to claim 6, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as

described in claim 5, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings

specify Internet settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

21. Referring to claim 7, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as

described in claim 5, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings

specify an internet protocol address, a domain name server configuration, a gateway and

a WINS configuration. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

22. Referring to claim 8, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as

described in claim 5, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings

specify dialing settings or local area network settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

23. Referring to claim 9, DynamicAccess has taught a method for providing user's client

computer with configuration settings, the method comprising the steps of:

    a. specifying a location name for the user's client computer (page 10, col 1, lines 17-33, the location name must be specified, since the location setting is provided for this specific location;)

    b. specifiying location settings corresponding to the location name (page 10, col 1, lines 17-33;)

    c. sending the configuration to the use (page 10, col 1, lines 4-8.)

DynamicAccess however has not explicitly taught the configuration is sent to the user through e-mail.

However, Davis has explicitly taught that any non-text file could be included with an e-mail message as attachment. (Col 12, lines 43-45.)

A person with ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the main purpose of the invention is to allow the administrator to send configuration file to the client's computer. And e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to send file from one computer to another.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create an e-mail containing location settings encoded in an attachment, and send the e-mail and to the user as taught by Davis, because e-mail attachment has been a well-known method to communicating files between computers.

24. Referring to claim 10, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 9, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings are generically defined so as to apply to a variety of operating systems. (Page 10, col. 2, lines 41-47; DynamicAccess could be used on a variety of operating system.)

25. Referring to claim 11, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 10, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify Internet settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

26. Referring to claim 12, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 10, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify an internet protocol address, a domain name server configuration, a gateway and a WINS configuration. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

27. Referring to claim 13, DynamicAccess in views of Davis have taught an invention as described in claim 10, DynamicAccess has further taught wherein the location settings specify dialing settings or local area network settings. (Page 10 Col 1, lines 17-22.)

28. Referring to Claims 14-21, Claims 14-21 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the Claims 1-8. Therefore, the Claims 14-21 are rejected for the same reason as the Claims 1-8.

29. Referring to Claims 22-26, Claims 22-26 encompass the same scope of the invention as that of the Claims 9-13. Therefore, the Claims 22-26 are rejected for the same reason as the Claims 9-13.

Conclusion

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by

the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments

avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

31. Lenz, US Patent Number 6,029,196, has taught an automatic client configuration system

the provides administrator the ability to configure every client in a network with one file.

32. Frantz, US Patent Number 6,003,070, has taught an e-mail system and interface for

equipment monitoring and control.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is (703)

305-3391. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am to

5:00 pm.

34. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sheikh Ayaz R can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone numbers

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239

for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

35. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Liang-che Alex Wang

December 24, 2002

PATRICE WINDER

PRIMARY EXAMINER